

abuse us? So I was able to pass a little law that said if the IRS abuses you, you can sue them for \$1 million. Shirley Barrons of Derry, New Hampshire, was the first to be successful. The IRS settled out of court for half a million dollars. Did you ever hear of that?

One of the main reasons I voted for Mr. HASTERT, which caused the problems on my side of the aisle, was the Democrat Party would not even have a hearing on a Traficant bill that dealt with important IRS matters.

Before 1997 you were guilty and had to prove yourself innocent in a civil tax case. Most tax cases are civil. If it is crime or fraud, the IRS has the burden, but that is in very few cases. They are usually civil and the burden of proof was on the taxpayer.

The Traficant bill said, look, the IRS comes out to audit you, and you co-operate and they are not satisfied. They decide to litigate. The burden of proof transfers to the Secretary of the Treasury and the IRS. They should have the burden.

The second provision said they can no longer from a back room decide to take your home, they had to have judicial consent. I want to give credit on the floor to Mr. Bill Archer, no longer here, former Republican Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who called me.

My language was not in the original IRS reform bill in 1998 because it was going to be vetoed. It was too strong. Mr. Archer, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), they helped get the Traficant language in.

I want to give you the statistics. The bill was passed in 1998. Comparing 1997 to 1999 figures, wage attachments, 1997, 3.1 million; 1999, 540,000. Property liens, 1997, 680,000; 1999, 161,000. But, listen to this: "Life, liberty and the pursuit of property." That was the language, the original founding fathers' language. The last change to one of our great documents was "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness." That is how important property was. Property seizures, 1997, 10,037; 1999, 151.

When they needed judicial consent and had to prove it, they could not take our homes. They were stealing our homes. What is wrong with us, America?

So it is time now for some additional reforms. There are two of them. The major reform bill that I have before the Congress now is known as the Fair Justice Act. It requires the President nominate for a 10-year term a Director of the Fair Justice Agency, who must be confirmed by the Senate, with one exclusive role, to investigate and prosecute wrongdoing and crime in the Justice Department.

Madam Speaker, they investigate themselves. The fox in the hen house

investigates the fox that raided the hen house. Do you really believe that jury in Waco got the true facts?

We spent \$40 million on Monica. Now, look, the President may have been a threat to chastity, but he was not a threat to liberty. And we did not spend one dime on China. China, who has taken \$100 billion of trade surplus out of America, buying nuclear attack submarines, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and have announced they have aimed them at us. We are financing World War III, and there was no investigation whether a Red Chinese general gave money to the Democratic National Committee. Shame, shame.

Lastly, dealing with the IRS, listen carefully. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) touched on it. We need a flat tax in America. But why should it be an income tax? A recent study from Harvard said 24 percent of the cost of an American-made automobile is the Tax Code, and when it is shipped overseas it gets hit with a value added tax. Is it any wonder we do not export any cars? Thirty-three percent of the cost of a loaf of bread is the Tax Code.

□ 1100

I think, hey, you do not have to be a rocket scientist here. The Tauzin-Traficant 15 percent national retail sales tax will be introduced as soon as this tax bill is completed now before the Congress.

I am going to vote for those tax cuts. Here is how the Tauzin-Traficant bill works: No more income tax, no more withholding, no more capital gains tax, no more inheritance tax, no more tax on savings, no more tax on education, no more tax on investment, and the IRS is abolished. Nothing personal here.

Forty-five States already collect a State sales tax. They get one penny per dollar to collect the tax. The companies who do the selling get half a penny for their paperwork. We get 98.5 cents. You will be surprised to find out that 90 percent of all retail sales are conducted by less than 9 percent of American retailers.

Madam Speaker, what do we need the IRS for? How can there be freedom in America if you have to look through the Tax Code to see if you should buy a car this year or sell your apartment this year? Why should we have to look into a Tax Code to see if we can give our property to our kids? What is wrong? What happened to America? What has happened here? Something is very wrong.

MEMORIAL DAY, A SPECIAL THANKS TO WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Now we come to Memorial Day, and I want to thank all of the veterans. I recently spoke on the construction of the World War II Monument on the Mall; certainly hallowed ground indeed. Washington, Jefferson, think about it. Founders. Lincoln preserved America. All our veterans are special, but the generation of World War II, those who died and those who

still live, they not only saved America, they saved the entire world. It is right and fitting that that monument be built on the mall.

Thank a veteran. I thank all veterans for preserving our freedom. I say this to all veterans, you have won the wars but, by God, the politicians have lost the peace.

It is time to bring our country back to the people. I have confidence in this Congress. I have confidence in Speaker HASTERT. IRS reform is important, welfare reform. Now it is time to reform the powerful Justice Department and now it is time to put the people in our government back together.

People should not be afraid of the government. We are the government.

I want to thank the Democrat leadership for allowing me this time, and I appreciate some of the things that they have done recently to promote involvement in school construction and other actions in education.

ETHANOL PRODUCTION IS PART OF THE ENERGY SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, over the last several days a great deal has been said about our national energy crisis. Unfortunately, most of the commentary has centered on finding blame. At various times, the Bush administration, the Clinton administration, the California legislature, energy companies, environmentalists and others have been blamed.

As I see it, the main value of looking at the past is to make sure we do not repeat the same mistakes that caused the current problem. However, dwelling on the past and attempting to fix blame serves no useful purpose and actually impedes progress. What is needed now is to identify solutions and start moving toward those solutions.

In my previous profession, which was coaching, there are all kinds of people that could say what went wrong and why it went wrong, but this really did not accomplish anything. What we were looking for was people with proactive ideas, because they were able to help relieve the situation.

Part of the solution to the current energy crisis that would appear to benefit all factions involved would be that of ethanol production. The use of ethanol in gasoline has been proven to reduce harmful emissions by 30 to 50 percent and is a renewable source of energy. Therefore, it benefits the environment and should certainly please the environmental community. It has a potential to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by a small but significant amount, which serves our national interests and benefits consumers.

It utilizes grain surpluses, improves commodity prices and benefits the agricultural community. If you look at

what is going on in agriculture today, ethanol may be about the only real bright spot out there for those who grow row crops. We are poised to increase our ethanol production by 200 to 300 percent, as dozens of new ethanol plants are in various stages of development.

The one deterrent to this development is uncertainty as to whether the 2 percent oxygenation requirement for fuel is going to be waived. Currently, about eight-tenths of 1 percent of our national fuel consumption is provided by ethanol. It could very easily go to as high as 5 or 6 percent. If the oxygenation requirement is waived, the demand for ethanol could go down close to zero.

So this is a huge factor for those who are involved in the ethanol industry. It is extremely important for all concerned that the matter of whether or not the waiver for oxygenation standards will be granted or not be granted. Further delay will only serve to exacerbate the problem.

ETHNICITY, WE HAVE COME A LONG WAY IN THIS COUNTRY BUT WE STILL HAVE A WAY TO GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, an odd thing happened to me 2 days ago on my way down to the Department of Energy. I was going down to give a talk to employees there, and I was stopped by the guards when I was trying to enter the building and I was asked repeatedly, my staffer and I were asked repeatedly, whether we are American citizens. This occurred both before and after I presented my congressional identification card.

Now I have walked around the White House, the Supreme Court, this United States Capitol, and I know that there is sensitive information at the White House, at the Supreme Court and sometimes here, but maybe, maybe the Department of Energy is a special case, perhaps.

What they said was that they asked everyone, everyone, whether they are a U.S. citizen or not, but that proved not to be true. My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), went yesterday and he was not asked the way that I was at all.

The ultimate irony is that I went to the Department of Energy 2 days ago to give a talk, at their request, about the progress of Asian Americans in America as part of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month celebration activities by the employees there.

There has been progress over the last 200, 215 years for Asian Americans in America but apparently we have a little ways to go yet.

Now I am reluctant to make much of this incident and I was just going to let

it go, but upon reflection, Mr. Speaker, I cannot just let this go because it would be wrong and it would break a promise that I have made to students in Oregon and that I have made to students across this country.

When I visit with students at home and in other places around the country, sometimes they ask, are you treated fairly? Is there any difference because of ethnicity in the U.S. Congress? And I always answer, no, I am treated very well and very fairly and there is no question about ethnicity in the House, and that is absolutely true.

Then sometimes there is a follow-up question, have there ever been incidents in your life that caused you to reflect upon or make you think that you are discriminated against?

At that point, I generally try to refocus the direction of the discussion. I say, look, look, you are here in school to study, to work hard. You need to focus on those things that you can change, that you can effect, and if you focus on those things then this country will give you a chance to succeed and, please, please do not obsess about things that you cannot change because some of the attitudes you cannot change right away. If you obsess about those things, they will take away from your efforts at focusing on your goals and your future success, because this country will give you that chance.

I say to them, leave those other things, leave those things that cannot be changed in the short-term, leave those things to adults like me. Leave those things to people who are in a position to work on them, like me.

If I had just let this incident go, this incident of 2 days ago at DOE, I would have broken my promise to those students at home and across this country, because I believe that it is our obligation, despite whatever our reluctance might be, despite whatever our discomfort might be, to point out those things which are not right or to investigate them, to see if they need to be improved. I am going to encourage the Department of Energy to redouble its efforts, engage in a true process of soul searching. Do you really ask everyone their citizenship at the door? And if so, is that an effective way of enhancing national security?

I do not know how many spies you have caught with that question, but you have at least one Congressman. And I suspect that ultimately there is a connection to national security but in a way that you might not expect, and that is there is a tremendous number of Asian American scientists and engineers working at the Department of Energy and they have made valuable contributions to our national security by doing good research.

If the Department creates a work environment that is hostile or perceived to be, we have already begun to lose some of those scientists, and my understanding is that some of the brightest graduate students in the country, who happen to be Asian American, are now

refusing to go work for the Department of Energy. That is as damaging to our national interest, our national security, as anything that I can think of.

I want to underscore once again that this is not about the specific incidents of 2 days ago and this is not about me, but it is about a pledge to students to work on issues that they are not in a position to work on themselves, and it is about doing this job, my job, in the best manner that I know how.

Being a Member of Congress is the greatest honor that I can imagine. We have no mission other than to get up each and every day and to try to make the world a little bit better, or to ameliorate some of the problems that people face. Today I want to give that effort to make the world a little bit better just one small further nudge.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS IN BOSNIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-78)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the Levin Amendment to the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act (section 7(b) of Public Law 105-174) and section 1203(a) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261), I transmit herewith a report on progress made toward achieving benchmarks for a sustainable peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In July 2000, the fourth semiannual report was sent to the Congress detailing progress towards achieving the ten benchmarks that were adopted by the Peace Implementation Council and the North Atlantic Council in order to evaluate implementation of the Dayton Accords. This fifth report, which also includes supplemental reporting as required by section 1203(a) of Public Law